

Interview Summary

Application No.
09/825,896

Applicant(s)
Steiner et al

Examiner
Rebecca Cook

Group Art Unit
1614



All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Rebecca Cook

(3) _____

(2) Rouget Henschel

(4) _____

Date of Interview Dec 13, 2001

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☒ Personal [copy is given to 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No. If yes, brief description:

Claim(s) discussed: _____

Identification of prior art discussed:

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, paragraph one is withdrawn.

Amendment to overcome rejection under 35 U.S.C 112, second paragraph was discussed.

Double-patenting rejection was discussed.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached

REBECCA COOK
PRIMARY EXAMINER
ART UNIT 1614

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.